UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/680,286	10/06/2003	Marguerite A. Cervin	CL2180USNA	5853	
	7590 09/19/200 DE NEMOURS AND (EXAMINER			
LEGAL PATE	NT RECORDS CENT	CHOWDHURY, IQBAL HOSSAIN			
BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WILMINGTON	N, DE 19805		1652		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/19/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-Legal.PRC@usa.dupont.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/680,286	CERVIN ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Iqbal H. Chowdhury, Ph.D.	1652	

	Iqbal H. Chowdhury, Ph.D.	1652	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 August 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. A The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.		•
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered b	ecause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	ensideration and/or search (see NO	TE below);	
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		•	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rei	ected claims.	•
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ootoa olamiio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	* **	mnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		inpliant Amendment	(FTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	timely filed emendme	ent consoling the
non-allowable claim(s).		unlery med amendine	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro		ll be entered and an e	explanation of
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	·		
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2 and 8</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	A before as an Abe date of filling - N	-46 A	
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attacl	ned.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		
		•	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amendments to claims 1 and 8 i.e. "capable of bioconverting — carbon source to 1,3-propanediol" by using E. coli strain, and "SEQ ID NO: 65", now have changed the scope of the claims 1 and 8 that raise new issues, which need new search and further consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: All previous rejections are maintained in view of non-entry of the amendments.

Applicants arguments regarding rejoining of claim 6 and rejection of claim 8 under 112, 2nd paragraph is moot due to non-entry of the amendments of claims.

Previous rejection of claims 1-3 and 8 under 112 (1) Written description and enablement is maintaiened. The Examiner agrees with the argument about disruption of endogenous recited genes in E. coli strain but disagrees with the arguments regarding genetically upregulating of said endogenous genes in E. coli. Applicants argue that procedues of upregulation and downregulation of genes are routine experimentation for those of ordinary skill in the art. This is not found persuasive because the specification does not describe what is the specific method used for a specific gene for upregulation of describe what is the specific method used for a specific gene for upregulation of describe what is the specific method used for a specific gene for upregulation of describe what is the specific method used for a specific gene for upregulation of describe what is the specific method used for a specific gene for upregulation of describe what is the specific method used for a specific gene for upregulation of describe what is the specific method used for a specific gene for upregulation of describe what is not found persuasive because the specification does not describe what is the specific method used for a specific gene for upregulation of genes are routine experimentation, and the procedure would not be the same for each genes. Every gene is regulated by distinct methods, such that knowledge regarding one gene is not applicable to others and one would need specific information regarding the regulatory pathway of each gene in order to increase the expression from an endogenous gene. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not know how to make the claimed invention, which would require undue experimentation. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

REBECCA E. THE SINER PRIMARY EXPERIMER

2